UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,577	06/11/2001	Jean-Jacques Monbaron	APPS-02	3301

7590   03/25/2005

Nicholas A. Pandiscio
Pandiscio & Pandiscio, P.C.
470 Totten Pond Road
Waltham, MA 02451-1914

EXAMINER
PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 May 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *20-23* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
    application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-19 in the reply filed on

05/06/2004 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

There are two periods at the end of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, the phrase "substantially" renders the claim indefinite

because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the

claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Excel (2000).

In regards to claim 19, Excel teaches an information handling apparatus comprising: a computer system having a central processing unit and a display device coupled to said central processing unit (inherent in Excel); a transactional database containing, on a line item basis, data in at least the following dimensions: items, people, actions and time (See Figure 1); and a schema involving user-defined actions and links between actions for managing data contained in said database according to specific workflows (See Figure 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
       obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Microsoft Excel (Screen Shots) in view of Kelman et al. (US 6850896).

In regards to claim 1, Excel teaches a method of navigating a business

application software using a computer system having a central processing unit, a

display device coupled to said central processing unit, and a transactional database

containing business information according to the dimensions of Items, People, Actions

and Time, said method comprising (See Figure 1): simultaneously displaying symbols

on said display device separately representing the categories of Items, People, Actions,

and Results (See Figure 2, Element 1); accessing through any of said symbol

information contained in the software application or said database which is related to

the category represented by said any icon(See Figure 2, Element 1); and displaying the

accessed information via a screen display specific to the said any symbol (See Figure 2,

Element 1). Microsoft Excel does not specifically teach showing icons on said display

device. Kelman teaches icons in a database that enable switching between different

screens of information (Figure 2, "Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman and include icons to carry out switching of

different screens within an application with the motivation to provide the user with a

more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 2, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 1. Excel further teaches a method wherein said icons are displayed on a substantially continuous basis (See Figures 1-5).

In regards to claim 3, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 1. Excel further teaches a method comprising accessing and/or altering through the Items icon any information contained in the software application or said database which is related to selected physical or non- physical elements, including but not limited to products, parts, assets, services and other physical or non-physical resources (See Figure 2).

In regards to claim 4, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 1. Excel further teaches a method a method comprising accessing and/or altering through the People icon any information contained in the software application or said database which is related to real people, including but not limited to customers, prospects, vendors, suppliers, employees, contractors, or transportation agents (See Figure 3).

In regards to claim 5, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 1. Excel further teaches a method a method comprising accessing and/or altering through the Actions icon any information contained in the software application or its database which is related to activities performed within an organization or between the organization and its external business partners, including but not limited to quotations, orders, picks, invoices, credit checks, and return authorizations (See Figure 3).

In regards to claim 6, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 1. Excel further teaches a method comprising accessing through the Results icon summaries of data contained in the software application or its database, whether in graphical, tabular or text form, whether on screen, on a file, or in print (See Figure 5).

Claim 7 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 8, Excel teaches an information handling apparatus comprising: a computer system having a central processing unit and a display device coupled to said central processing unit; a transactional database containing, on a line item basis, data in at least the following dimensions: items, people, actions and time (See Figure 1); and a graphical user interface coupled to said computer system comprising (a) means for causing said display device to display symbols representing the dimensions of items, people, actions and results (See Figure 2, Element 1), (b) means for accessing through any one of said symbols data contained in said database (See Figure 2, Element 1), and (c) means for managing the accessed data according to algorithms contained in the software and workflows defined by the user (See Figure 5). Microsoft Excel does not specifically teach showing icons on said display device. Kelman teaches icons in a database that enable switching between different screens of information (Figure 2, "Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman and include icons to carry out switching of different

screens within an application with the motivation to provide the user with a more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 9, Excel teaches an information handling apparatus comprising: a computer system having a central processing unit and a display device coupled to said central processing unit (inherent in Excel); a transactional database containing, on a line item basis, data in at least the following dimensions; items, people, actions and time (See Figure 1); and a graphical user interface coupled to said computer system comprising (a) means for causing said display device to display symbols representing the dimensions of items, people, actions and results (See Figure 2), and (b) means operative through selection of any of said symbols for accessing data contained in said database and managing the accessed data according to specific workflows related to the dimension represented by said any symbol (See Figure 4). Microsoft Excel does not specifically teach showing icons on said display device. Kelman teaches icons in a database that enable switching between different screens of information (Figure 2, "Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman and include icons to carry out switching of different screens within an application with the motivation to provide the user with a more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 10, Excel teaches an information handling apparatus comprising; a central processing unit (inherent in Excel); a display device coupled to said central processing unit (inherent in Excel); a transactional data base coupled to

said central processing unit for storing data relating to at least items, people, actions

and time on a line item basis (See Figure 1); software defining a scheme for managing

and processing said data and for generating results according to selected workflows

(Figure 5); and a graphical user interface characterized by (1) means for causing said

displace device to display separate symbols as metaphors for items, people, actions

(Figure 2) and results and to generate separate screens for use in accessing and

processing data on the basis of items, people, actions and results (Figure 2), and (2)

means for causing said software to display data according to said scheme on the basis

of items, people, actions or results (Figure 2, Element 1). Microsoft Excel does not

specifically teach showing icons on said display device. Kelman teaches icons in a

database that enable switching between different screens of information (Figure 2,

"Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to combine Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman

and include icons to carry out switching of different screens within an application with

the motivation to provide the user with a more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 11, Excel teaches an information handling apparatus

comprising: a computer system having a central processing unit and a display device

coupled to said central processing unit (inherent in Excel); a transactional database

containing, on a line item basis, data in at least the following dimensions: items, people,

actions and time (Figure 1); and a graphical user interface coupled to said computer

system comprising (a) means for causing said display device to display symbols

representing items, people, actions and results (Figure 2), and (b) means responsive to

selection of any of said symbol for accessing specific software and managing and

processing data contained in said database according to said accessed specific

software (Figure 2). Microsoft Excel does not specifically teach showing icons on said

display device. Kelman teaches icons in a database that enable switching between

different screens of information (Figure 2, "Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman and include icons to carry out switching of

different screens within an application with the motivation to provide the user with a

more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 12, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of

claim 11. Excel further teaches an information handling apparatus wherein said specific

software defines a workflow (See Figure 5).

In regards to claim 13, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of

claim 12. Excel further teaches an information handling apparatus wherein said specific

software comprises a first database table that defines types of actions to be executed

by said computer system and a second database table that defines possible links

between said action types (See Figures 1-5).

In regards to claim 14, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of

claim 13. Excel further teaches an information handling apparatus wherein said specific

software comprises a third database table that contains a record of links between

actions that have been executed or are planned for execution (See Figures 1-5).

In regards to claim 15, Excel teaches an information handling apparatus comprising: a computer system having a central processing unit and a display device coupled to said central processing unit (inherent in Excel); a transactional database containing, on a line item basis, data in at least the following dimensions: items, people, actions and time (See Figure 1); and a graphical user interface coupled to said computer system comprising (a) means for causing said display device to display symbols representing items, people, actions and results (See Figure 2), and (b) software defining a schema for managing data contained in said database according to specific workflows accessed by selection of one of said icons (See Figure 5). Microsoft Excel does not specifically teach showing icons on said display device. Kelman teaches icons in a database that enable switching between different screens of information (Figure 2, "Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman and include icons to carry out switching of different screens within an application with the motivation to provide the user with a more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 16, Excel teaches an a graphical user interface for accessing data stored in a computer system that includes a display device, said interface comprising (a) means for causing said display device to display symbols representing the dimensions of items, people, actions and results (See Figure 2), (b) means for accessing through any one of said symbols data contained in said database (See Figure 2), and (c) means for managing the accessed data (See Figure 2). Microsoft

Excel does not specifically teach showing icons on said display device. Kelman teaches icons in a database that enable switching between different screens of information (Figure 2, "Compare, Research, Etc...."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Microsoft Excel with the teachings of Kelman and include icons to carry out switching of different screens within an application with the motivation to provide the user with a more identifiable screen description.

In regards to claim 17, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 16. Excel further teaches a graphical user interface wherein said graphical user interface is adapted to provide four separate screens, one each for Items, People, Actions and Results, with each of said screens displaying all of said icons (See Figures 1-5).

In regards to claim 18, Microsoft Excel and Kelman teach all the limitations of claim 17. Excel further teaches a graphical user interface according to claim 17 wherein each of said screens includes one or more tabs or buttons that represent options available to the user with respect to accessing or processing data (See Figures 1-5).

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100